REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed January 25, 2008. Claims 1-4, 7-10 and 13-16 were pending in the present application and rejected by the Examiner. Applicant has canceled claims 5, 6, 11, 12, and 17-20. No claims have been amended. Claims 1-4, 7-10, and 13-16 remain pending in this application after entry of this response.

Reconsideration of the rejections is requested based upon the following comments.

THE CLAIMS

Cancellation of Claims due to Restriction

Non-elected claims 5, 6, 11, 12, and 17-20, which were previously withdrawn due to a restriction, have now been canceled without prejudice.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-4, 7-10 and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rawat et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,662,340; hereinafter "Rawat") in view of Center et al (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0171964; hereinafter "Center"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claim 1

Applicant submits that claim 1 is not rendered obvious by a combination of Rawat and Center. Applicant submits that the method for processing electronic forms recited in claim 1 recites several features that are not disclosed by Rawat or Center, considered individually or in combination. For example, claim 1 recites, in part:

identifying at least a second descriptor associated with a field in the first electronic form that does not have a corresponding identifier in the set of identifiers stored for the user;

determining a second value entered in the field associated with the second descriptor; and

> updating the set of descriptors whereby an identifier corresponding to the second
> descriptor is included in the set of identifiers stored for the user and the second value is associated
> with the identifier corresponding to the second descriptor. (Applicant's claim 1, in part)

As recited above, a second descriptor associated with a field in the first electronic form is identified that does not have a corresponding identifier in the set of identifiers stored for the user. A second value entered in the field associated with the second descriptor is determined. The set of descriptors in the user information is updated to include an identifier corresponding to the second descriptor and the second value is associated with the added identifier. In this manner, the user information (that comprises the set of identifiers) is updated with the identifier corresponding to the second descriptor and the associated value. Thus, as recited in claim 1, the user information is automatically updated to include information for a field and a value entered in that field.

Applicant submits that at least the features discussed above for claim 1 are not taught or suggested by Rawat. Rawat is not concerned with updating any user information. Rawat discloses a system for automatically filling out fields of a form with appropriate data from a user profile, without requiring prior mapping or examination of the form. (See Rawat: Abstract; Summary). Rawat is concerned only with mapping fields in an electronic form to preconfigured metadata, which is then used to fill the fields using user profile data. However, Applicant submits that Rawat does not teach or suggest at least the *"identifying . . ."*, *"determining a second value . . . "*, and *"updating . . ."* features recited in claim 1.

The Office Action asserts that the *"identifying . . ."* feature recited in claim 1 is taught by Rawat at col. 4 lines 28-62 and col. 6 line 61 - col. 7 line 23. Applicant respectfully disagrees. As indicated above, in Rawat, a field in an electronic form is mapped to preconfigured metadata, which is then used for determining the data to be filled in the field. Col. 4 lines 28-62 of Rawat describe that the fields in an electronic form are mapped to user data based on visible form elements such as field labels on the electronic form. Col. 6 line 61 - col. 7 line 23 describe how a field that does not have a label is mapped to preconfigured entries in a field label dictionary. Thus, both of the identified sections of Rawat describe how a field of a

form, whether it has an associated label or not, is mapped to preconfigured field label dictionary entries and metadata.

This is completely different from the *"identifying . . ."* feature recited in claim 1. In the *"identifying . . ."* feature, a second descriptor associated with a field in the first electronic form is identified that does not have a corresponding identifier in the set of identifiers stored for the user. Thus, as recited in claim 1, the user information does not comprise an identifier corresponding to the second descriptor associated with the field. This is completely different from Rawat in which a field is always mapped to preconfigured field labels or metadata. Rawat does not teach anything about identifying a field associated with a field descriptor that has no corresponding identifier in the field dictionary or metadata. Rawat does not describe a situation where a label associated with a field does not map to preconfigured label dictionary entries or metadata. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the *"identifying . . ."* feature recited in claim 1 is <u>not</u> taught by Rawat.

Further, the Office Action asserts that the *"determining a second value . . . "* recited in claim 1 is taught by Rawat at <u>col. 4 lines 43-62 and col. 8 line 33 - col. 9 line 5</u>. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 1 recites that a second value entered in the field associated with the second descriptor is determined. Applicant would like to point out that this feature determines the value entered (not "to be entered in the field") in the field. Rawat, on the other hand, is only concerned about determining values to be entered in fields of an electronic form and does not disclose anything about determining values entered in filled fields. Col. 4 lines 43-62 of Rawat describes that the fields in an electronic form are mapped to user data based on visible form elements such as field labels on the electronic form. Col. 8 line 33 - col. 9 line 5 of Rawat describes refining the granularity of field mapping based upon context of the fields in the electronic form. Accordingly, these sections of Rawat only describe mapping fields to metadata for determining data to be entered in the fields. However, neither of these sections describes anything about determining a value entered in the field, as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the *"determining a second value . . ."* feature recited in claim 1 is <u>not</u> taught by Rawat.

Appl. No. 10/660,950
Amdt. dated July 23, 2008
Reply to Office Action of January 25, 2008

PATENT

With regards to the *"updating . . . "* feature recited in claim 1, the Office Action acknowledges that updating the set of descriptors is <u>not</u> taught by Rawat but asserts that the *"whereby . . . "* clause is taught by Rawat at <u>col. 4 lines 43-67, col. 5 lines 14-32, figs 1, 2 and associated text</u>. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The *"whereby"* clause, as recited in claim 1, qualifies how the updating is done. Accordingly, if the Office Action acknowledges that the updating is not taught by Rawat, this inherently also implies that the *"whereby"* clause, which indicates how the updating is done, is also not taught by Rawat. Further, Rawat is not concerned with updating user profile information. The sections of Rawat cited by the Office Action are limited to teaching that fields in an electronic form are mapped to metadata which is used to determine user profile data to be used to fill in the fields -- this does <u>not</u> teach anything about updating the user profile itself or including identifiers in the set of identifiers stored for a user. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the *"updating . . ."* feature recited in claim 1 is <u>not</u> taught in its entirety by Rawat.

The Office Action goes on to assert that the *"updating . . ."* is taught by <u>Center</u> at <u>paragraphs 0043, 0045, 0046, 0051, and 0052</u>. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Center describes a system for referring prospective customers to prospective dealers by identifying dealers closest to the customer and giving preference to those with which the customer has had a previous relationship. (Center: Abstract).

Paragraph 0043 of Center describes steps depicted in FIG. 3 of Center related to a process for displaying search results. As described in this paragraph, different dealers may be displayed based upon prior service of selling relationships of the customer with the dealers. This however has nothing to do with updating a set of descriptors, as recited in claim 1.

Paragraph 0045 of Center describes that the display for each dealer may have links to additional information such as how to obtain a price quote, a map, driving directions, and other information related to the dealer. Paragraph 0046 of Center describes how the information may be displayed on a web page. These paragraphs however have nothing to do with updating a set of descriptors, as recited in claim 1.

Paragraph 0051 of Center describes the screen shot depicted in FIG. 4 of Center that a user can use for entering information that is used for searching for a dealer. Some of the

fields of the screen may be automatically populated if a cookie is present with the information. However, the ability to automatically populate fields does not by itself automatically teach or imply the feature of updating a set of descriptors, as recited in claim 1.

Paragraph 0052 of Center describes the screen shot depicted in FIG. 5 of Center for displaying a results page to the customer. The page displays a dealer list based upon the customer input entered in the page of FIG. 4 of Center. Again, Applicant submits that this paragraph of Center has nothing to do with updating a set of descriptors, as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the *"updating . . ."* feature recited in claim 1 is not in any manner taught or suggested by Center. Center thus <u>fails</u> to cure the deficiencies of Rawat. Applicant thus submits that even if Rawat and Center were combined as suggested by the Office Action (even though there appears to be no motivation for the combination), the resultant combination would <u>not</u> render claim 1 obvious. Applicant thus submits that claim 1 is patentable over a combination of Rawat and Center.

<u>Claims 2-4, 7-10, and 13-16</u>

Applicant submits that independent claims 7 and 13 are also patentable over a combination of Rawat and Center for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for claim 1, and others.

Applicant further submits that dependent claims 2-4, 8-10, and 14-16 that depend from claims 1, 7, and 13 respectively, are also patentable over a combination of Rawat and Center for at least a similar rationale as discussed for the allowability of the independent claims. The dependent claims are also patentable for additional reasons.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sujit B. Kotwal/

Sujit B. Kotwal
Reg. No. 43,336

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
Attachments
SBK:mg
61284887 v1